

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT TACOMA

RAY CLARENCE ROGERS,

Plaintiff,

v.

KING COUNTY, *et al.*,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 2:23-cv-01034-DGE-GJL

ORDER ON PLAINTIFF'S  
MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF  
TIME

Plaintiff Ray Clarence Rogers, a pretrial detainee proceeding *pro se*, filed this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Currently pending before the Court is Plaintiff's Motion for Extension of Time to Respond (the "Motion"). Dkt. 154.

Plaintiff filed an Amended Complaint on July 9, 2024, adding new facts and several new Defendants to his claims. Dkt. 116. All Defendants represented by the King County Prosecuting Attorney's Office (the "County Defendants") filed a Motion to Dismiss the Amended Complaint on September 11, 2024. Dkt. 143. Plaintiff now moves for an extension of time of one hundred

1 and twenty (120) days to respond to the Motion to Dismiss. Dkt. 154.<sup>1</sup> Plaintiff notes that his  
2 criminal trial (for offenses carrying the possibility of a life sentence) is scheduled during October  
3 2024. *Id.* at 2. The Court also recognizes the restrictions on Plaintiff as a *pro se* detainee, many  
4 of which he has raised in previous filings. Dkts. 55, 61. The Court finds that an extension of sixty  
5 (60) days accommodates these restrictions.

6 Plaintiff's Motion for Extension of Time (Dkt. 154) is **GRANTED in part**. Plaintiff may  
7 file his Response to the County Defendants' Motion to Dismiss by **December 10, 2024**. The  
8 Clerk's Office is directed to **RE-NOTE** the Motion to Dismiss (Dkt. 143) to **December 17,**  
9 **2024**.

10 Dated this 9th day of October, 2024.

11  
12 

13 Grady J. Leupold  
14 United States Magistrate Judge  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

---

23 <sup>1</sup> Plaintiff's Motion also requests that he be appointed counsel for this action. Dkt. 154 at 3. The Court rejected two  
24 requests for counsel on September 26, 2024, finding that Plaintiff failed to show the exceptional circumstances  
required for the appointment of counsel. Dkt. 152 at 2. The Court similarly rejects this request for the same reasons.